

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/532,755	03/22/2000	Craig A. Finseth	PD-990193	8261	
20991 7590 07/13/2007 THE DIRECTV GROUP INC PATENT DOCKET ADMINISTRATION RE/R11/A109 P O BOX 956 EL SEGUNDO, CA 90245-0956			EXAMINER		
			SHELEHEDA, JAMES R		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,		2623		
	•		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
•			07/13/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)		
09/532,755		FINSETH ET AL.		
	Examiner	Art Unit		
	James Sheleheda	2623		

	James Sheleheda	2623	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>02 July 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL	ICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of ving replies: (1) an amendment, affice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o	Appeal. To avoid aba fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	rce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THI	g date of the final rejecti	on.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further complete (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belomore) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or They present additional claims without canceling a second content of the content	nsideration and/or search (see NO w); ter form for appeal by materially re	TE below);	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.11		ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s). 		timely filed amendme	ent canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is protected. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 11-14 and 16-19. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 26-43,45,46,49-5.	vided below or appended.	II be entered and an e	explanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	entry is below or attacl	ned.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 		n condition for allowa	nce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).13. ☐ Other:	(22lly	
		CHRIS KELLEY	

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In response to applicant's arguments on pages 14-15, of applicant's response,

Zigmond discloses a targeted advertising system wherein ad attribute information and user selection history information is compared to select advertisements for a viewer (column 11, lines 17-49 and column 17, lines 10-20). Zigmond further discloses wherein the system will discard advertisements having a value less then or equal to some predetermined threshold value, as ads are pre-screened and only ads meeting the viewers selection criteria is retained (column 15, lines 17-23 and column 17, lines 10-20).

Zigmond fails to specifically disclose the specific mechanism for calculating which ads are retained or discarded, i.e. calculating similarity scores for each of the ads and discarding ads which have a score less then or equal to the threshold.

Review of the Knee reference shows that Knee does specifically disclose the features of comparing user selection information (paragraphs 35, 36 and 50) and ad attribute information (paragraphs 46, 47 and 50) to calculate similarity scores for the ad (paragraph 47). Only ads exceeding a threshold value are then chosen for display (as ads must meet some minimum value; paragraph 32).

Thus, the combination of Zigmond and Knee clearly disclose the current claim limitations, and therefore applicant's arguments are not persuasive.